

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VINCENT ROBERT MACKEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

DELLA BAKER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [22-cv-05105-JSC](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
VACATE**

Re: Dkt. No. 30

Plaintiff, a California prisoner proceeding without an attorney, filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against officials at San Quentin State Prison and a Forensic Psychologist with the California Board of Psychology. The Court reviewed the first amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, ordered it served upon Defendants Sergeant Baker and Lieutenant Teixeira based upon two cognizable claims, and dismissed the remaining claims. (ECF No. 19.) Thereafter, the Court corrected the service order, dismissed the claims against Defendant Sergeant Baker and ordered service upon Defendant Della Baker instead. (ECF No. 27.) Plaintiff has filed a motion to “vacate” the latter order, which Defendants oppose. Plaintiff has not filed a reply brief.

Where the Court’s ruling has not resulted in a final judgment or order, reconsideration of the ruling may be sought under Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which provides that any order which does not terminate the action is subject to revision at any time before the entry of judgment. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b). “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *School Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). Plaintiff has not presented

1 newly discovered evidence, shown clear error or manifest injustice, or shown an intervening
2 change in the law. Plaintiff simply asserts that he has made proper claims against both Sergeant
3 Baker and Della Baker. For the reasons explained in the prior orders, his claim against Sergeant
4 Baker for filing a rules violation report (“RVR”) (*see* ECF Nos. 1 at 3; 12 at 3) is not a valid due
5 process claim (ECF Nos. 11 at 3:23-4:4, 4:23; 19 at 2:26-3:9, 4:14-15), whereas his claim against
6 Counselor Della Baker for putting false information in his file (ECF Nos. 1 at 2-3; 12 at 2-3) is a
7 claim that the Court is able to rule upon (ECF Nos. 11 at 3:3-8; 19 at 2:18-21). Plaintiff’s
8 disagreement with the Court’s conclusions, without more, is not sufficient reason to reconsider or
9 vacate the Court’s prior order. Plaintiff asks why the Court had to correct its prior order. As
10 previously explained, the correction was due to the Court’s mistakenly treating Counselor Della
11 Baker and Sergeant Baker as one person. (ECF No. 27 at 2:3-2:6.)

12 Plaintiff’s motion to vacate is therefore DENIED.

13 This order disposes of docket number 30.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: February 28, 2023

16
17 
18 JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28